DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 724 JC 730 224

AUTHOR	Brossman, Sidney W.
TITLE	California Views Toward Statewide Governance of Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION	Center for State and Regional Leadership, Florida.
SPONS AGENCY	Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE	Sep 73
NOTE	39p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; *Governance; *Master Plans; *Post Secondary Education; Program Development; *State Colleges; Technical Reports
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

The Master Plan for Higher Education for the state of California is examined in its relationship to the community colleges of that state. The sections of this monograph are as follows: Community College Characteristics; Enrollment Growth; Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges; Two-Year Institutions; Local Control; Coordinating Council for Higher Education; proficiency levels any developmental courses that must be taken before the student and Number of Campuses; Goals, Purposes and Priorities; Who Should Determine Which Goals?; Role of Manpower Projections; Accountability Consistent with Goals of Post-Secondary Education; Is There a Quantifiable Product or Output of Post-Secondary Education?; Who Is Post-Secondary Education for?; and What Assumptions about Society and Its Future Should Underlie Statement of Goals and Purposes of Post-Secondary Education? (DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 082724

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CALIFORNIA VIEWS TOWARD STATEWIDE GOVERNANCE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By Sidney W. Brossman

JC 730 224

DEPARTMENT OF
HIGHER EDUCATION
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

ED 082724

CALIFORNIA VIEWS TOWARD STATEWIDE GOVERNANCE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

Dr. Sidney W. Brossman

Chancellor

California Community Colleges

A publication of the Center for State and Regional Leadership (Florida State University/University of Florida) with the assistance of a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation

Tallahassee, Florida

September, 1973

PREFACE

This monograph is one of the series developed as part of the in-service program sponsored by the FSU/UF Center for State and Regional Leadership available to state directors of community/junior colleges or their designees. Supported in part by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, this in-service program is designed to enable an official to study a problem of significance to his state or to record proven procedures and techniques used in a long-range activity of that state which would offer potential applicability for other states.

Two previous monographs addressed the important task of long-range planning for a state system of community/junior colleges. Dr. Lee G. Henderson, Director of the Division of Community Colleges for the state of Florida, developed a monograph describing theoretical and systems approaches to long-range planning at the state level. His publication, entitled A Plan for Planning for a State Community College System, was written essentially from the point of view of a state anticipating, in the early stages of, such an endeavor.

Mr. John C. Mundt, State Director for the Washington State Board for Community College Education, wrote a monograph entitled Long-Range Planning for Community College Education, which described a program planning budget and evaluation (PPBE) approach to planning which has been underway in that state for several years. That document essentially addresses the reality of long-range planning from the perspective of an actual experience.

This monograph, developed by Dr. Sidney S. Brossman, Chancellor of the California Board for Community Colleges, might be described as a report or viewpoint of planning after several years have passed. The document essentially describes the California community college system, showing it at the various stages from the early period of little coordination to the present stage of systematic and statewide coordination.

The three monographs might be read as a three-part series focused upon comprehensive planning at the state level. They should be of value and interest not only to state directors of community and junior colleges but to officials responsible for coordination of all post-secondary education at the governmental level and to officials of colleges and universities at the local level as well. It

is important that coordinating boards appreciate the design and approach of planning taking place in the sub-system of post-secondary education encompassed by the two-year colleges. It is equally important for institutional officials to understand how their local perspective is part of the building blocks anticipated and needed for assuring educational opportunity to all of the citizens of a given state.

Dr. James L. Wattenbarger, Director of the Institute of Higher Education of The University of Florida, and I direct the Center for State and Regional Leadership. A series of planned experiences for doctoral students preparing to serve in state agencies bring the two groups together regularly. That cooperation extends to assistance in identifying state officials for the in-service grants as well as outlining a method of attack for the problem identified and then assisting the grantee in completing the project successfully. A published report of the activity is required as a condition of the grant which necessitates cooperation between the universities in reading and editing the manuscript. Thanks, Jim, for your help on this one.

Mr. Frank D. Brown, a Kellogg Fellow and doctoral student preparing for state level administrative service, has assumed responsibility for the publications program at our center. We appreciate the work he has done and we appreciate the typing of the manuscript by Mrs. Sharon Stovall which made this monograph a reality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	iii
Introduction	1
Community College Characteristics	1
Enrollment Growth	2
Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges	3
Two-Year Institutions	3
Local Control	4
Coordinating Council for Higher Education	5
Continuing Education	5
Occupational Education	6
Transfer Function	7
Finance	8
Size and Number of Campuses	9
Goals, Purposes and Priorities	10
Who Should Determine Which Goals?	17
Role of Manpower Projections	18
Accountability Consistent With Goals of Post-Secondary Education	19
Is There a Quantifiable Product or Output of Postsecondary Education	21
Who is Postsecondary Education For?	22
What Assumptions About Society and Its Future Should Underlie Statement of Goals and Purposes of Postsecondary Education?	29
FOOTNOTES	33
BIBLIOGRAPHY	35

CALIFORNIA VIEWS TOWARD STATEWIDE GOVERNANCE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Two of the most important events in the history of the California Community Colleges are development of the Master Plan for Higher Education and adoption of the Donahoe Higher Education Act. As a result, the tripartite system of public higher education in California was created, the Community Colleges became formally an integral part of higher education in California, and functions of the three segments of public higher education were delineated. The Board of Trustees of the California State Colleges was authorized, pointing to the subsequent establishment in 1968 of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education was created, with participation on a statewide body, for the first time, of representatives of the Community Colleges.

The year 1960 was one of promise: California was thrust into national leadership in governance of higher education, other states began to establish their own versions of coordinating councils and to delineate functions of institutions of higher education. And the comprehensive California Community College became increasingly a model for emulation across the country.

It is important to emphasize here that the Master Plan is a well-conceived plan and has served to guide higher education during the rapid growth of the sixties. That does not mean the Master Plan should not be revised--for it should. But it is important to remember that the very title of the Master Plan includes the dates "1960-1975." So it is entirely appropriate that the Master Plan be re-examined and up-dated. Such re-examination is occurring, not only in California, but in many other states as well.

Community College Characteristics

One of the most significant results of the Master Plan is that it helped to preserve the essential characteristics of the Community Colleges: two-year institutions, locally-controlled, with comprehensive campuses offering occupational-technical training and career programs, adult and continuing education for all members of the community, academic transfer

programs, and general education and pre-professional programs, with heavy emphasis on counselling and student services. These are roles that should be part of Community College functions throughout the nation. And--despite phenomenal enrollment increases--the Board of Governors and local boards are devoting much effort to strengthening all these characteristics.

Enrollment Growth

One of the most important developments since the Master Plan is the growth in enrollments in California's Community Colleges, well beyond all projections, and almost 50 percent beyond the Master Plan estimate. This has occurred in other states as well, but particularly in California. But with higher enrollments has come a tighter financial squeeze. Inflation, growth, and diversion of students have resulted in too much of the cost borne by the local property taxpayer. With higher enrollments and the financial squeeze has come the difficult task of insuring that all Community College transfer students are admitted into four-year institutions. And with higher enrollments has come the need for expanded Community College facilities, additional campuses, and adequate capital outlay funds.

This has been a period of innovation and expansion, with the 96 California Community Colleges continuing to fulfill their objectives and improve wherever possible. California Community Colleges in 1959, when the Master Plan was developed, had a total enrollment of about 300,000. In 1973 the figure is approximately 930,000, or an equivalent of well over 600,000 full-time students. Since 1959, Community College enrollments have increased over 200 percent. And just since 1968, when the Board of Governors went into operation, enrollments have increased 35 percent:

> The reasons for these enrollment increases are many. For one thing, the cost per student is low for the state--one of the lowest in the nation, in fact--and there are no tuition charges for resident Community College students....Still another reason is that it became apparent at the end of the 1960's that the Community Colleges would provide the greatest opportunities for disadvantaged students....Finally, the business slump and lower employment in the state in the late 1950's and early 1960's increased enrollments in the two-year colleges, which was no surprise to these institutions.[1]

Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

During this period of growth the Board of Governors instituted a number of important new programs in addition to monitoring standards and requirements of previous years. The Board of Governors also carried out new programs mandated by the Legislature, assumed responsibilities for Community Colleges formerly held by the State Board of Education, and provided new services to Community Colleges. Important among the new programs administered by the Board of Governors is the Extended Opportunity Programs and Services Act. Created by the Legislature and the Governor in 1969, this program is designed to assist disadvantaged youth in attending and progressing satisfactorily through Community Colleges. The Board of Governors has distributed over $6 million this year to the Community Colleges for EOPS programs.

The Board of Governors also has been heavily involved with the approval of additional Community College campuses, research and data-gathering, student and faculty participation in governance, innovative techniques of teaching, new Community College credentials, admission-transfer problems, district organization, operational finance, capital outlay, facilities planning, ethnic programs, apprenticeship programs, tenure, continuing education, occupational training, educational program approvals and master-planning, interstate district cooperation, utilization standards, cost and construction standards, program budgeting, grading and scholarship standards, and other planning and service functions.

Two-Year Institutions

One thing the Board of Governors has not done is to encourage Community Colleges to go beyond their present functions as two-year institutions. There is no baccalaureate syndrome in Community Colleges in California. They do not have aspirations of upward mobility. They do not wish to emulate the State University and Colleges or the University of California. And they do not want to be three-year or four-year institutions or to award the baccalaureate degree, even occasionally.

The Community Colleges are two-year institutions. They are teaching institutions, and they are proud of their role in the tripartite system of public higher education in California. Higher education today needs to reduce the number of years in college, not increase it.

In addition to two-year programs, the Community Colleges are also offering more and more six-month and one-year certificates leading to employment and encouraging students to take the most suitable programs.

Local Control

The system of governance of the Community Colleges is demonstrably successful, by any measure or standard. The system of local boards working cooperatively with the Board of Governors not only works, it works well.

The Board of Governors has worked hard, not only to improve the comprehensive nature of Community Colleges and provide service to the campuses, but also to refrain from interference with local boards. While shirking no statewide responsibilities, the Board of Governors regards local management of Community Colleges as a touchstone in all its deliberations. The reason for this is that the genius of the Community Colleges is their relationship and responsiveness to their local communities. The people of California have a direct impact on what goes on in their Community Colleges, and they feel part of--not apart from--these colleges in their communities.

Local control has led to healthy diversity and innovation among the Community Colleges. During this period throughout the nation of re-examination of governance of higher education, local management of Community Colleges must be maintained.

Today, among the strongest supporters of the Board of Governors are those who voiced some of the greatest concerns in 1967, fearing that a new statewide board might erode local prerogatives. There are two major reasons for the successful cooperative relationship between local boards and the Board of Governors: first, the Board of Governors is dedicated to the principle of governance with maximum control at the local level, and second, there is a fine delineation of functions between local boards and the statewide board.

Three examples will illustrate this distinction: 1) the Board of Governors established minimum standards for employing faculty and administrators, but local boards employ and assign all such personnel, 2) the Board of Governors approves capital outlay plans, but local boards carry out their own construction programs, and 3) the Board of Governors approves new educational programs, but

local boards establish and approve classes within these programs. Local boards regularly review academic plans and programs in order to reduce costs and program proliferation because they are directly responsible to the local property taxpayers.

Coordinating Council for Higher Education

The Coordinating Council has an important role to play in California's system of public higher education. California needs an over-all advisory body, a group which brings together representatives of the segments of education with representatives of the general public.

The functions of the Council are to advise governing boards of public higher education and appropriate state officials on levels of support sought and on delineation of functions, and to develop plans for the orderly growth of the three public segments.

There has been little advice from the Council on delineation of functions, a fact which reflects, not the neglect of the Council, but the apparent success of this part of the Master Plan.

Generally, the Council has made useful contributions by examining educational programs. The Council should continue this function by inquiring as to the future demands and needs for graduate and professional education. This area involves occupational instructors in Community Colleges, and a review of the need for modifications in the pre-service and in-service aspects of professional education would be useful. The Council could also provide a useful service by coordinating the functions of continuing education of the segments, particularly since this is an area of significant change.

Continuing Education

One of the single most important subjects to consider in any examination of statewide governance is continuing education and ways to insure that Community Colleges play a vital and primary role in this program: "Adult education at the Community College level does and should play an essential role in helping adults adjust to increased leisure, to changing technological requirements in the work place, and to their civic responsibilities."2 The people of California depend upon Community Colleges to offer adult and continuing education, including remedial

and retraining programs and the full range of programs for adults. These programs have been notably successful and extremely well received--and demanded--throughout the state.

The entire subject of continuing education should be examined in California and most states. Both the Strayer Report in 1948 and the Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education in 1955 avoided many problems involved in continuing education. The Master Plan sidestepped the more basic problems of continuing education. If any restructuring of higher education is to take place, it would appear most logical to be as a result of innovations going throughout many states in nonresident degree programs.

Occupational Education

Related to continuing education is one of the most significant missions of the Community Colleges: Occupational training. All public higher education should be examined continuously in the context of occupational education. For instance, what does the student get from higher education in performance on the job? What good does higher education do a student, besides getting a degree? What is the relationship between a baccalaureate degree and the job the student eventually takes?

Every Community College in California offers a wide range of programs geared for the world of work, from relatively low-level entry jobs to highly-skilled technicians. And these are not all two-year programs. Many are one-year and six-month certificate programs for retraining and direct employment. Because of the great emphasis that Community Colleges put on counseling and guidance in occupational education, many students who enter the Community Colleges with the intention of pursuing a professional career decide instead to seek technical and paraprofessional training.

In California no part of the Community College mission is considered by the Board of Governors and local boards to be more important than occupational education, and the success of these programs is attested by the performance of Community College students and by business, industry, government and the professions the length and breadth of the state. As a result, the Community College is becoming an increasingly important factor in manpower and employment needs. Business and industry are actively

recruiting employees from these institutions, and their graduates are apparently being employed much more readily than those from four-year institutions. "The integrated approach to occupational education may well represent a more fundamental and profound development in higher education than even its most ardent champions realize. It may well portend sweeping changes in all levels of American education, particularly in the high schools and in the four-year colleges."[3]

Community College students are being selected for management training positions that were once open only to four-year graduates. In some fields demand exceeds supply, as contrasted with the over-supply of some professionals and Ph.D's. Industry. business, and government employers realize that many tasks being performed by professionals can be done just aswell by the occupationally-educated Community College student. There are over 3,200 different occupational programs in California's public two-year institutions--an impressive achievement, as attested by educators in every part of the country.[4]

Since 1959, when the Master Plan was developed, occupational education enrollments in California Community Colleges have gone up 265 percent. And just since 1968, when the Board of Governors went into operation, these enrollments have gone up 25 percent. The percentage of full-time enrollment in occupational education in California Community Colleges has been increasing at a much faster proportionate rate than all other Community College enrollments. For example, the percentage of occupational education in California's Community Colleges in 1964 was 42%. This went up to 58% in 1968. Since that time, this percentage has gone up to 62%.

Transfer Function

California's Community Colleges are performing a significant and economical function of providing programs for transfer to four-year institutions. Nor is there any question about the high quality of these programs. All reports and evaluations have shown consistently that Community College transfer students perform as well or better academically than so-called "native" students in universities and four-year colleges.

If higher education in California, or in any other state, is to work together well, each segment must be an equal partner in the tripartite system. The smooth and

equitable transfer of students from Community Colleges to four-year institutions is an absolute necessity to the functioning of the higher education system. Equitable transfer is in the best educational interests of the students and in the best financial interests of the state. Any arbitrary or capricious constraints on transfer of Community College students would render the Master Plan almost meaningless, would hamper the educational progress of students, and would increase significantly the cost of higher education.

Community Colleges have consistently requested equity with native students for transfer students. Any re-examination of governance of higher education should determine whether all transfer students, after completing their lower division work in a Community College, are afforded equality of treatment and opportunity with students who have completed their lower division work in universities and four-year colleges. This means equal treatment in registration procedures, equal access to majors, and equal criteria by which students move from lower division to upper division. Moreover, studies should consider whether any requirements for grade point averages should continue to be imposed differently on native and transfer students.

Finance

Until 1973 the Community Colleges in California were deeply distressed that recommendations in the Master Plan for financing Community Colleges had not been implemented. The Master Plan recommended that 50,000 students be diverted from the University and State Colleges to Community Colleges and that state funding for Community Colleges be increased, therefore, to 45 percent. The Community Colleges absorbed 50,000 additional students--and more--but, until 1973, the state percentage of support remained about the same: approximately 33%. The rest was provided largely by local property taxpayers.

Shifting these students from state-supported four-year institutions amounted to a transfer of about $30 million a year from state financing to local financing. The cost per full-time student in a Community College is about $900. Of that, the state had provided only about $300, leaving about $600 to be paid by local property taxpayers. California's Community Colleges could not have survived for long with that king of financing. A

greater share from the state was needed if Community Colleges were to continue to be the kinds of institutions that serve the people of California so well.

Because of these critical needs and because of issues such as the Serrano v. Priest case and changes in the age of majority and in residency requirements, state leaders in California developed a number of changes in the financing pattern of Community Colleges. As a result of passage of legislation by Senator Alfred E. Alquist of San Jose, and signed by Governor Ronald Reagan in July 1973, state support for Community Colleges has now been increased to 42%. This legislation provides for an additional $65 million for Community Colleges, including $13 million for property tax rollbacks.

Earlier, there had been no provision in law for annual increases in the foundation program of apportioning state funds to Community Colleges, and such a procedure was needed to provide at least some minimal stability. Ample evidence was developed that the real level of expenditure per student in California's Community Colleges had declined markedly during the past two decades. This decline was caused primarily by the lack of provisions to adjust for annual increases in prices of resources required by Community Colleges. The new legislation not only provides a 1973-74 foundation program for "regular" students of $1,020, but also includes increases of $60 per average daily attendance in 1974-75, $63 in 1975-76, and $66 in 1976-77. In addition, the loss of some federal funds may be recouped by the Community Colleges levying a like amount on local property taxes.

In addition, the legislation provides funding for "defined adults," combines some permissive tax rates to establish new general purpose tax rates, provides for adjustments in census dates and enrollment measurement for apportionment purposes, and eliminates state basic aid for out-of-state and foreign students.

Size and Number of Campuses

Related to questions of financing and student enrollment is the equally important question of the size and number of campuses. Community Colleges reflect the needs of their communities as part of their very existence, and even more so since these local communities provide an average of more than half the operating costs of California's two-year institutions. Every Community

College should not necessarily be planned the same way and for the same number of students. To do so would ignore the role of Community Colleges and ignore the needs of students and their communities. Standards, therefore, for the enrollment capacity of Community College campuses should be set primarily by local boards and should reflect differing local needs. In response to these needs, Community Colleges have departed in many instances from the traditional campus in the use of satellite centers, cluster colleges, store fronts, and other methods of delivering education.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has lauded the Community Colleges and estimated 29-34 additional Community College campuses in California by 1980.[5] The Master Plan for Higher Education recommended no more than 6,000 students in any Community College.

Goals, Purposes and Priorities

One of the most important developments of the past decade in California higher education has been the enormous growth of the Community Colleges, as indicated earlier, well beyond all projections. With that growth has come a greater need for reliance on principles and standards which will provide for continuing the service and opportunities the Community Colleges have provided, together with realistic goals, policies and priorities which allow for flexibility and adjustments required to meet needs for change and improvement.

Community Colleges make concentrated efforts as part of their very existence to reflect the needs of their own local communities. It is for this reason essentially that every Community College should not necessarily have identical specific goals and priorities. To do so would ignore the role and concept of Community Colleges and would neglect the specific needs of more than a million Community College students and their communities in the near future.

The next 10 to 15 years will bring dramatic changes in all areas of educational activity in California, and the challenges which face those with responsibilities in public higher education must be met with a great amount of advanced thought and study. The goals-setting process can be ignored only if one is ready to accept the uneven results that are likely to follow. The setting of goals and objectives for education, and in particular for public higher education, is a necessary activity.

The relative success obtainable in long-range planning, implementation, assessment, accountability and use of resources depends on a clear and concise understanding of over-all goals and specific objectives. Thus, establishment of goals for any one segment of public higher education must be coordinated carefully with such goals for other segments. The application of state policy for all public higher education should be the logical development resulting from such coordination.

What are the needs of the states for higher education? In the coming years these needs can be expected to be varied and changing with greater emphasis on improving the environment, especially in urban areas, and in serving an increasing job market in service industries, such as health care and recreation. Due in part to increased leisure time, people are becoming more involved in governmental affairs, and sufficient postsecondary education in government and economics is necessary for them to be effective participants in the social and economic process.

There will be an increased need for career opportunities in some professional fields with a demand for improved medical and dental care. Careful monitoring will be required of manpower needs in certain fields to counsel some prospective students away from overcrowded fields into fields with brighter prospects.

There will be a need for intra-campus cooperation to bring about sharing of facilities as an alternative to constructing buildings for each new program that emerges. The segments of public higher education must concentrate more on eliminating programs no longer relevant. Through the years some programs may have gained a type of stature and seniority that has successfully overcome existing evaluation methods. To continue such programs or activities could mean, in times of financial stress, that new and more needed programs and activities will not have adequate resources.

Each segment of public higher education will have short-range and long-range roles to play in meeting needs. In terms of most criteria, it is evident that the Community Colleges should continue their responsibility of satisfying the majority of the needs of the states and their people for postsecondary education. The stated aims and objectives of Community Colleges are thus directed toward the majority of those who will seek postsecondary education.

Individual. As productive life is extended, as leisure time becomes more abundant, and as mobility increases, individual needs will be magnified. In addition to making a living as a productive citizen, an individual must also be able to use his leisure time wisely and to be aware of needs of the total society.

Regarding manpower, it is widely accepted that a person initially prepared for one career may need to be retrained several times during a span of working years due to increasingly rapid sociological and technological changes. Thus, there must be corresponding accessibility to postsecondary education, both in the proximity of educational programs and the financial means to take advantage of them. More than one half of all high school graduates tend to go to college if there is a public Community College within commuting distance, whereas one third or fewer do so if there is no college in the community.

It is important that public higher education maintain the perspective that, while it can make important contributions to an individual's personal needs, higher education should not be expected to provide an institutional panacea for personal problems that extend beyond the realm of learning and doing as society becomes more complex.

Societal. The needs of the states and their people in social awareness, as accomplished through postsecondary education, will require more involvement of colleges in their communities. In this connection a trend of the past few years has been the recognition of planned community-oriented experiences as important parts of the educational process.

Proliferation of specialties and the consequent extension of professional and graduate study may keep some individuals in the status of "student" until their late twenties or well into their thirties. An assessment should be made of the impact on society and upon individuals of such extended studies.

There should be an opportunity within the total system of postsecondary education for each high school graduate or otherwise qualified person to enter higher education. This should not mean that every young person attend college. Many will not be motivated to attend, and there may be others who may not benefit sufficiently to

justify the personal time and expense involved. Community Colleges should continue to offer universal access for those seeking to enter higher education.

California's institutions of public higher education should also consider new commitments of many young people. These young people are part of a changing multicultural society. They reflect many groups, including subcultural groups, that are assuming an emergence and importance that could not have been predicted a few short years ago. Both those who admire and object to new behavior patterns of these groups can agree that California's colleges and universities can instill in them reason and desire to display their proposals in a constructive way. An appropriate goal would be to encourage them to rise above preoccupation with fault-finding and to become engaged constructively in improving society.

Economic. Economically, each generation must have the capacity to move the next generation toward the goals of society. A generation properly educated will generate the earning power to contribute to the increasing needs of the succeeding generation. If California and the nation are to absorb the social and economic stresses caused by changing manpower needs, adequate postsecondary vocational/technical programs must be developed: "As the only segment of public higher education in the state legally empowered to offer one- and two-year programs that are explicitly vocational, these two-year colleges must supply the technicians and middle-management people to staff businesses and industries and farms."[6]

The occupational and professional attainment by minority groups in California has a positive relationship to the degree of access to higher education. Equalizing educational opportunity for the individual citizen, in general, should lead to a higher percentage of minority persons at the higher occupational and professional levels. This can be accomplished by basing programs on three fundamental points: (1) All economic barriers to educational opportunity should be eliminated, thus closing probability differentials for college access and completion, (2) the curriculum and environment of the college campus should not be a source of educational disadvantage or inequity, and (3) substantial progress should be made toward improving educational quality at levels prior to higher education and toward providing universal access to higher education where it is not available.

Community College occupational education, an essential need for a large and growing number of California youths and adults, fills a basic and dynamic role in the state's economy. The policy of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges is to give great attention to maintaining, strengthening, and fulfilling the goals of occupational education in Community Colleges. As a leading source of training and retraining for students throughout California, Community College occupational education is directed toward fostering and maintaining improvement in career programs. Occupational education is not only a personal economic goal, but is also important to state and national goals.

Operating primarily with financing, administration and control under local governing boards and integrated with the Board of Governors, occupational education is associated closely with business, industry, labor, public service, and the professions to support manpower requirements of the American economic system. To help meet state and national needs, occupational education in the California Community Colleges has the following goals: (1) to prepare students for employment in established and emerging occupations and assist in placing them in jobs or in more advanced training programs, (2) to counsel students in making occupation choices consistent with ability to achieve their aspirations and with job markets, (3) to assist those already employed to acquire more skills to maintain their level of employment, to advance, or to change fields, (4) to seek out and develop those ideas which lead to instruction in and development of skills and proficiencies in new and emerging occupational opportunities, and (5) to determine that counseling is always current to the needs of occupational skills and opportunities.

Parallel to these goals are the commitments of Community Colleges to extend and improve their programs in occupational education for as many students as possible. Occupational education is geared to realistic opportunities and planned to suit the needs, interests, abilities and economic awareness of students. Programs also benefit those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and need training to compete in the labor market, along with those upgrading or learning new skills. Programs provide for students with academic, economic or other disadvantages and also provide work experience and on-the-job training.

To help realize the foregoing goals, the following objectives are the responsibility of Community College districts, working in cooperation with the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges:

1. To assess needs and acquire financial resources for developing and expanding occupational education in Community Colleges.
2. To evaluate occupational education in Community Colleges in relation to state and national goals and provide background on the roles of business, industry, labor and the American economic system.
3. To set priorities in occupational education and improve articulation involving segments of secondary and higher education, including high school juniors and seniors enrolled in Community College courses.
4. To use research, local and area planning and evaluation to improve occupational education operations in Community Colleges and to gather and disseminate information on occupational education to insure maximum benefits.
5. To develop and improve consulting and administrative support services to occupational programs at local, state and federal levels.
6. To widen the scope of occupational programs serving disadvantaged students.
7. To increase the effectiveness of occupational education by implementing work-experience and on-the-job training opportunities and broadening the relevance of instruction for students and employers.
8. To identify needs and provide in-service educational opportunities for professional development of personnel in occupational education.

Through these steps, and others, the Community Colleges are helping the people of California to benefit.

An unfortunate side effect of American society has been the mistaken notion on the part of some parents and students that the baccalaureate degree is appropriate for all. This concept of a full college education for all could result eventually in the lowering of standards and perpetuation of irrelevant educational programs. The vast majority of employment opportunities now and in the years ahead may not necessarily require a type of readiness related to four or more years of college.

Civic. There is an increased educational emphasis in California and the nation for urban and suburban concerns. Our cities are deteriorating, and postsecondary educational institutions are in a position to prepare people to deal with problems of the inner city, the ghetto, and the myriad problems of sprawling suburbia.

A goal of higher education should be to provide appropriate activities and programs that will lead to mature judgment on subjects of civic importance. In this connection there should be further assessment of the role of student governments. Community Colleges are now active in pursuit of the goals of greater civic and government awareness.

Are there conflicts among the above? If civic, economic, societal and individual needs were accommodated by the total educational process, little or no conflict would occur. However, the assessment of needs and the subsequent establishment of priorities probably would result in less than total commitment to all the needs. In such cases conflicts will occur which will place a constraint on the remaining priority matters.

There will always be conflict in precisely matching societal postsecondary education needs to individual desires for education and training. All public higher education should monitor facilities and staffing requirements in respect to building facilities and hiring faculty to meet student demands in a particular area if there is evidence that doing so will contribute to an oversupply of manpower in a particular field.

Criteria to set goals for postsecondary education. Ideally, goals should be established through the process of needs assessment. This involves the determination of what exists now and what should be. Lay public as well as educators should participate and express their views concerning what should be short-range goals in the near future and long-range goals in the distance.

Some of the criteria which might be used in setting goals for postsecondary education include an examination of the particular philosophy of education that is being pursued, assessment of manpower and occupational field needs, realization of the extent of resources available for postsecondary education (including those which are economic, physical, and financial), and the necessity of establishing a priority among these several criteria.

In establishing specific goals in higher education there are a number of questions to be asked in the goal-setting process: Who will benefit by it? Is the goal in question more realistically a function of another segment of higher education? Can the goal in question be obtained through inter-district or inter-institutional cooperation rather than through a single college? Is it financially feasible? Can we locate qualified faculty and students in sufficient numbers to make the goal reachable?

Another major standard might be subjection of proposed goals to considerable measurement and analysis before embracing particular innovations. The shortcomings of some previous educational reforms should serve as reminders in any exhuberance to move too rapidly in the direction of change.

Who should determine which goals?

The goals of postsecondary education should be determined by as broadly-based a group as possible, including representatives of state and local levels of government, educational institutions, and the public. This group should have as much data as possible regarding enrollment growth, manpower needs, available economic resources, physical resources, and future trends.

Goals-setting, divided between long-range goals and short-range objectives should take place at both state and local levels. As an example, short-range training objectives in a specific occupational field or professional skill is an appropriate local objective, derived from a broadly-stated goal of the need to fulfill requirements in a given occupational area.

Informed citizenry at the local level should participate in the development of such goals and objectives. A viable model exists in the Community Colleges, whose ability to be responsive to changing needs can be seen as a touchstone of one of the economic role served by these community institutions. Local district citizens are responsible for further development and refinement of Community College goals. To determine meaningful goals properly there must not only be extensive participation on all levels, but those involved must also have available broad background information and understand how the Community Colleges relate to other segments of education. All groups participating in this

process should have data as complete as possible, including information on educational programs, student services, present and future enrollment trends, career development needs, and fiscal resources.

Local development of specific goals in Community Colleges has long been accepted as an integral part of the educational process in California. The Community Colleges are vitally, and necessarily so, responsive to their local constituents. This means of determining goals should be continued and protected by the state.

Role of manpower projections

Manpower need projections are valuable tools in helping to determine goals for postsecondary education. For example, projections showing only a slight need for professionally trained personnel but a great need for personnel with occupational skills should play a prominent part in determining such goals. Caution should be observed in the use of manpower projections for goal-setting to insure that a range of individual career choices continues to be available in postsecondary educational institutions. In California's Community Colleges, manpower-need projections have a significant role in determining goals for occupational programs. This part of Community College programs, which enroll over half of Community College students, has the responsibility of making students employable.

Each California Community College district is required to have a master plan for occupational programs. As a part of the plan, each district is expected to perform a job market analysis. This develops a file of information on existing, new and emerging occupations which fall within occupational programs offered or anticipated by the college. To perform the job-market analysis, Community Colleges rely heavily on manpower-need projections provided by human resources development data and advisory committees. Manpower projections need constant updating, and post-secondary education needs to change with the projections. Educational programs need to be phased out quickly as well as to be created appropriately. Available resources of facilities and staff need to be inventoried and staff in-service programs improved to capitalize on existing resources rather than create new resources.

Community Colleges are becoming an increasingly important factor in manpower and employment needs. Business and industry are actively recruiting employees from the

Community Colleges, and many graduates of Community Colleges are employed more readily than those from four-year institutions. Community College students are being selected for management training positions once open only to four-year graduates. In some fields demand exceeds supply, as contrasted with the over-supply of some professionals and Ph.D's. Industry, business, and government employers are saying that many tasks being performed by professionals can be done as well by occupationally-educated Community College students.

The maintenance of a manpower information system on a continuing basis is expensive, and for this reason, there is a need for a commitment by the state if planning for higher education programs is to be based on manpower projections. An alternative to manpower projections would be a sophisticated follow-up system of students completing various programs. A program trend could be plotted annually, and the projection could consist of an extension of a trend line for each program. Another alternative would be to have the colleges develop measurable objectives for their programs and provide an annual summary of the successes in meeting those measurable objectives. A statewide summary of such an activity could play a role in determining the goals for postsecondary education in that an inherent part of each of the program's measurable objectives would be that of a local manpower activity.

Accountability consistent with goals of postsecondary education

Fiscal support for public postsecondary education derives from the general public. It follows that those responsible for postsecondary education are responsible to the taxpayers of California and their elected representatives: "Where the expenditure of public funds is involved, legislators and state budget officers certainly have the right to know how these funds are spent. Where state funds are involved, a post audit is appropriate, as long as it does not interfere with the proper expenditure of funds."[7]

It is generally held that postsecondary institutions are directly responsible to their respective governing boards, and the respective governing boards are accountable to the people. As Professor Mayhew of Stanford has stated, "To epitomize the future for American higher education: sober realism, parsimony of claims, more economical management of a still large, complicated, and influential institution--this is the station toward which we are moving."[8]

Some mechanisms or measures of accountability which are currently feasible include the number of degrees granted, number of certificates (of proficiency) granted, certifications of satisfaction by employers, certifications (after an elapsed period of time) by alumni of relevancy and adequacy of their training. In occupational training an appropriate measure to be considered might well be the number of successful job placements.

Although these measures are meaningful for some purposes, other accountability needs require fulfillment through more specific application. Accountability is no mystery. It requires that higher education be held responsible for educational outcomes--for what students learn and for their ability to perform. Community Colleges may have the best accountability procedure ever devised: local management. Certainly, one of the most effective means of accountability is through a system governed by trustees accountable to the people in the community that elected them, the community of their college. Nevertheless, as Dr. Gleazer of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges has stated, "Community colleges are confronted with increasing demands for evidence of accountability--accountability to students for appropriate learning experiences and accountability to taxpayers for productive results."[9]

Methods of measuring low activity in educational programs in Community Colleges include one or more of the following factors to identify programs with a limited use and the number of students who reach their objectives: (1) transfer to four-year colleges and universities, (2) achievement of measurable educational objective, (3) number of units of credit initially enrolled in by students, (4) number of units of credit completed by students, and (5) number of credit hours by discipline enrolled in and completed.

Additional examples of activities that contribute to the measurement of various aspects of accountability and productivity in occupational education in California Community College programs are:

1. The Community Colleges Occupational Program Evaluation System (COPES), a research and development project of the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, involving a consortium of twenty Community Colleges. The stated intention is to develop and refine an evaluation system for occupational education.

2. A research project in model development in systems management designed to field test a model training program for occupational personnel. This project uses a system approach on problem-solving in planning, implementing and evaluating college projects.
3. An evaluation model development for marine technology programs, a project designed to develop and test an evaluation model.
4. The NORCAL Project, a field study to determine characteristics of most successful occupational education programs. This research project will identify and make available for local colleges criteria associated with most successful occupational education programs.
5. A cost analytic model for day credit occupational and new-occupational courses. This is a descriptive study with an experimental component. Adequacy of cost allocation generated by this study will be evaluated by a panel of experts from the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, the California Research Coordinating Unit and several Community Colleges.
6. An occupational information system model concerned with products of the current occupational information system. Final implementation will be made on the recommendations for modification to the existing occupational education system on a test and validation basis.
7. A research program for developing an evaluation model for handicapped and disadvantaged programs in Community Colleges.

Is there a quantifiable product or output of postsecondary education?

Postsecondary education's identifiable product or output is the educated, productive human being who is able to take his or her proper place in society. Such educational products are an integral part of society and become the participants and contributors to making it function for the benefit of all.

Productivity of Community Colleges in reference to their achievement of stated aims and purposes has been determined in a number of ways. Some of the methods used in measuring this are: 1) the number of students reaching their objectives, 2) placement in jobs to which students' college work is related, 3) promotional jobs held by students for at least one year, 4) transfers to four-year

colleges and universities, 5) number of units of credit initially enrolled in by students, 6) number of units of credit completed by students, and 7) transfers persisting to complete at least one year at senior institutions. If there is to be a quantification of "output," the preference of Community Colleges would be for the foregoing, although Dr. Astin of the American Council of Education defines "student outputs" as "those aspects of the student's development that the college either attempts to influence or does influence."[10]

But only if postsecondary education is clearly defined can there be an understandable quantifiable product. If the various institutions are designated as levels of education and various programs designated to fulfill specific objectives, students then are able to select the program meeting their individual needs. This does not eliminate the possibility of multi-level programs as long as the programs are well coordinated and students fully aware of the total program. In this way consideration can be given to a total program, and coordination of goals and objectives that clarify the direction and meaning of the program can be used, regardless of whether the program is academic or occupational.

Project COPES (College Occupational Programs Evaluation System) illustrates in a practical way that quantifiable products of educational systems in Community Colleges can be identified and used in program improvement. Of particualr significance is the fact that the project includes a system of judging the effectiveness of a college in a wide range of perceptions in producing desired programs. Such judgments are made by groups of instructors, students, administrators, advisory committee members and other lay citizens. The output of all educational programs should be some measure of students who complete a program in terms of their educational objectives. In occupational education this quantifiable product can be measured by a number of the methods stated above.

Who is postsecondary education for?

Postsecondary education should be for all persons who can benefit from participation. A goal, therefore, is universal equality of access. Under the Master Plan for Higher Education, for the majority of persons, "universal equality of access" means access to one of the California Community Colleges. Quantitatively, California has done

relatively well with postsecondary education. On an economy basis, equating students' time to available state and local dollars, there is every justification for greater investment in counseling services.

The greatest barriers to postsecondary education are distance from a postsecondary institution and lack of funds, which are often interrelated. A person within commuting distance of a college is far more likely to graduate from such institution as a person who lives beyond commuting distance. The imposition of such barriers as distance from an institution of higher education, and lack of personal financial resources, have deprived some California citizens and groups from equality of access to postsecondary education. Special efforts currently being made to bring in such groups should be continued until a level is reached whereby such previously deprived groups can participate equitably in California's postsecondary educational institutions.

It is an assumed role for institutions of higher education to help prepare people for full effective participation in the democratic process. In order to do this, postsecondary education should reflect the academic, cultural and economic mixture of the state.

There is in reality no optimum college attendance age--individuals of all ages should have the opportunity to be enrolled. There should not be only one pattern of attendance. Many students could profit from a semester or quarter attendance pattern of college attendance and work or some kind of volunteer service.

Universal equality of access. An appropriate goal for California postsecondary education is that identified in the Master Plan for Higher Education, that any Californian who can profit from it should have access to higher education. While this does not mean access to any and all institutions in California, it has come near to being achieved through the delineation of functions identified in the Master Plan, including specifying that the Community Colleges should be open to all who can benefit from instruction. Some may have become over-zealous in their pursuit of universal equality of access for California's young people, and, as a result, a mistaken notion may have emerged that a four-year college or university experience is a necessary prerequisite to successful living for all.

Barriers to postsecondary education. There are well-defined barriers of geography and lack of financial resources, and, although much has been done in the last decade to lower these barriers, equality has not yet been achieved. Despite the growth of Community Colleges throughout the state, there are still significantly large areas of the state without a Community College within relatively easy commuting distance. By contrast, even in those urban areas where one can find a concentration of institutions, other barriers often interfere with full opportunity for low-income students to participate in higher education. The increasing cost of education--even in tuition-free Community Colleges where many students have to forego needed income--continues to be a significant barrier to full and equal access. This is often even more acutely present among lower-income racial and ethnic minorities.

Elimination of barriers. To the extent that state and local resources permit, barriers of place and financial ability should be eliminated. State resources should encourage the addition of more public campuses or outreach centers to make certain that the accidental circumstance of residence will not be an effective barrier to equal access.

All states should have a responsibility to see that none of their citizens are deprived of equal access to postsecondary education. This may well take special efforts in recruitment of students and in financial aid in the establishment of special educational support services and in effective and personal counseling. With the knowledge that the state, along with the individual citizen, benefits from such an effort, there is also the knowledge that the state and citizen become the loser in the long run for those who cannot participate effectively in a productive way in society. Too frequently, these groups and citizens who have been deprived of equal access are the citizens who also become a burden to the state, and it is thus appropriate to direct special efforts to assure that all citizens have equal access.

A major feature of any plan to provide for access should be an assessment of the unmet needs for groups lacking adequate opportunity for postsecondary education. Such an assessment should include particularly access at least to programs in Community Colleges. Increasing attention should be given to adults whose education has been interrupted for various reasons. California Community Colleges have taken the lead in respect to persons who wish to resume or change their education and career fields.

Flexible admission standards. The California Community Colleges have open admissions policies and also admit high school dropouts who apply. There should be more options in public higher education for individual choice, such as deferred admissions and "stop-out" programs. Students should be allowed to enter and leave educational programs during the academic year in an "open entry"--"open exit" fashion.

The greatest areas of expansion in future college education will be outside the central core of the campus, e.g., continuing education, external degree programs, and these lend themselves to much greater flexibility in admissions procedures.

Cultural, economic and ethnic mixtures. Institutions and systems should be flexible and responsive to changing human and societal needs. Given the complex demands that might be made on the educational system of the state by a wide and diverse population, perhaps the most appropriate reflection of these elements, including the cultural and economic, should be in the communities where the institutions are located. An appropriate and well-defined example of such community responsiveness in terms of student mix exists in the Community Colleges of this state. By the very nature of their governance relationship, the colleges have close ties with the community and are responsive to their varying demands and needs.

All postsecondary education segments should make efforts to reflect the varied academic, cultural, economic and ethnic mixtures of their general area, and opportunity should be provided for all students who desire to attend the college of their choice.

Given the existing needs and priorities of both national and state economies and attendant impact on manpower needs and desirable skills, the state does have a responsibility to provide access for citizens beyond the "usual age of college attendance." The state should also provide for the retraining of citizens with bachelor of arts degrees for whom shifts in the job market may have resulted in their becoming unemployable. The coming years are likely to continue to see dramatic shifts in job and manpower needs that have characterized the past few years. A gratifying example can be seen in the recent history of the Community Colleges. The function of these two-year "comprehensive" institutions to serve

new interests has given the Community Colleges the ability to sense and identify changing community needs and design the appropriate courses to respond to these needs.

On the premise that the state does have a responsibility to provide access to all of its citizens who can profit from postsecondary education, priorities must be established to equate the degree of access of a particular program compared with others. The need for continual retraining, the great numbers of retired military personnel, and the extension of productive years all indicate there can be no "usual" age of college attendance. Findings and conclusions point to the recommendation that adult continuing education and the concept of life-long learning should be recognized as an important and necessary part of the process of postsecondary education. There may be many more working adults and older persons engaged in study for a number of reasons. First, the birth rate is leveling out, and soon there will be greater population at the middle or later years. The work week is becoming shorter and more flexible. Retirement years are earlier, and life expectancy is longer. The need to retrain workers is greater if we are to avoid early obsolescence.

The old notion of getting one's education out of the way during the early years and then working without interruption for thirty or forty years is a changing notion. Increasingly, colleges must meet the needs of working adults, retraining them and educating them for the wise use of leisure time. Colleges must not be isolated islands to educate the young adults. They must serve all people, and increasingly they must become involved with many agencies and institutions beyond the college portals, including business and industry.

"Drop in" and "drop out". Changing technology and varying life styles will continue to influence the way in which citizens can participate in postsecondary education. The prospect of increased leisure time available to a larger number of citizens, combined with the increased and varied manpower demands from a rapidly changing technology, will encourage greater participation in postsecondary education in varying patterns. The demands of society and early individual participation in a meaningful work experience will necessitate structural changes in the way education is conducted. This may allow the student to "drop out" or "stop out" at certain training points. Such periods of employment which follow may be of a continuing or interim basis, but the student should have the option

of returning at times convenient to him for further upgrading or a career shift. Such options should be available without penalty to the student and should be supported to some degree by state resources. The history of Community Colleges, with such limited-duration educational experiences as certificate programs of one-year to two-years and work-experience activities, provides a ready example of one way in which this flexibility can be accomplished: "Here the phrase 'drop out' may be misleading. From society's point of view, as well as the student's, however, a decision to leave a program leading to a degree in engineering in favor of taking a job as a technician may well represent success rather than failure."[11]

Today's students may not be as interested in the formalized education of eight semesters (four years) on a college campus. More and more students may be searching for the practical. They should be encouraged by allowing them to alternate periods of education, leisure, occupation and recreation. This type of flexibility has been recommended strongly by a number of sources, including the Carnegie Commission in its in-depth study of present-day higher education practices in the nation.

Students should be allowed to determine the kind and amount of higher education they wish. They should also be given credit for what they achieve in both career development and in academic achievement. To allow them an opportunity to count on one or two years of education for certain specified periods of employment when "stopped out" of college for a time provides incentive to return.

A preventive measure successfully being applied to dropping out is the work-experience program in California's Community Colleges. Work experience should be for everyone attempting a new career venture. It is particularly meaningful for the student who has been economically or educationally deprived. Work experience can teach students to concentrate on perfecting their employable skills and to gain a basis for direction for an educational and a career future.

Work-experience programs in Community Colleges also provide guidance for college experiences as well as job experiences that motivate students to stay in college. If the student elects to use work as a stop-gap measure and stop-out of college for a period of time, there should

be smooth avenues for re-entering to continue educational development as well as possible concurrent enrollment in different levels of education to accelerate the educational process.

Degrees, certificates, and diplomas. Degrees, certificates and diplomas represent in an inadequate but nevertheless tangible manner what a student has accomplished or completed. Although they have been criticized justifiably as failing to indicate anything about the person's real capabilities in a given area, they do serve to indicate general achievement. If the programs they represent are developed properly and provide depth in content, they can very well serve a useful purpose for prospective employers or others evaluating a person's background.

Inappropriate reliance on degrees, certificates and diplomas may be partly responsible for some artificial judgment of people at the expense of other competence. Young people and others are beginning to reject certificates and diplomas. It has become clear to many that their prospects for employment, social, and economic mobility are enhanced by leaving school sooner than they had originally anticipated. For example, the aspiring businessman or prospective engineer may have better fortunes in the labor market by leaving with the A.A. or A.S. rather than continuing on for the baccalaureate or advanced degree. The Carnegie Commission has suggested that the A.A. degree become the "standard degree": "This degree should be given full credit by employers in hiring and by institutions of higher education in accepting transfers. For increasing numbers of students it should become the standard degree to which they aspire after they leave high school--but with the exception that they may and often will return to college later in life."[12]

Granting certificates is an important function for Community Colleges. Many students elect to take course work in occupational courses only. The immediate goal of these students is to become employable as rapidly as possible, and, with a certificate, their collegiate work is recognized in somewhat the same manner as a degree recognizes a formal two-year or four-year program. Certificates serve a useful purpose to industry as well. Employers know that job applicants with a certificate from a Community College have completed an occupational program satisfactorily. In this way a certificate may provide more specific information to employers than a degree.

To the extent that degrees, certificates and diplomas represent the completion of certain recognized programs or training, they should continue to be awarded by postsecondary educational institutions. Consideration should be given in awarding degrees than has been the case, and experimentation with other types of degrees should be undertaken.

What assumptions about society and its future should underlie statement of goals and purposes of postsecondary education?

A wide variety of specific assumptions should be stated by any postsecondary institution before it begins the process of developing goals. Specific assumptions should be based on the premise that postsecondary education must play an active role in society's constant attempt to improve itself. These assumptions should recognize unique or special characteristics of given institutions.

In addition, certain general assumptions can be applied across the broad spectrum of postsecondary education. While general assumptions cannot cover all possible eventualities, understanding of them at state and local levels provides for continuity of purpose and direction. Following are some of these general assumptions:

1. Society is willing to support postsecondary education, at least to the present dollar level, and regards it as one of the basic attributes of a free and open society.
2. Society supports the principle of equal access to postsecondary education.
3. Society supports the principle that the quality of education it provides is directly related to the contribution to society by those who receive the education.
4. Society will be willing to provide adequate financial support for public institutions of higher education so long as it feels it is receiving a just return for its investment.
5. Society may be willing to increase its support to postsecondary education, but only if it is accountable for positive results of its programs.

Postsecondary education has a dual role to perform in its relationship to cultural values and norms. Education is the institution most responsible for preserving and conveying society's highest ideals and values. In any reassessment of its role, this responsibility should

be maintained. The need of society for a secure custodian of its traidtional values and norms has enhanced that role. However, no society is static, and cultural values and norms undergo constant reassessment, the results of which can be subtle or dramatic. No educational institution should become so impervious to change that it represents opposition to the recognition of change. The extent to which postsecondary education takes cognizance of such changes should be reflected in a modification of programs. Ideally, institutions should assume a questioning role as they perceive changing patterns in cultural values and norms.

The extent of awareness will depend to some extent on the shock of the change. For example, there has emerged an appearance of extreme modification in student attitudes, reflecting the changing job situation and changing interests of students. This change in student attitudes will require institutions to be more flexible. Postsecondary education will be required to maintain effective communication with the agents of change. And educators must find out what kind of future the public wants. All decisions cannot be made by only those at the top.

Research and teaching functions are ideally suited to such identification and incorporation of change. The effective assumption of such a role leads the institution into a position of influence, but, more appropriately, into an active relationship between the institution and the society and community it serves.

Priorities among goals of postsecondary education. Ranking of educational goals should be done in such a way as to preserve appropriate differences among colleges and universities. Establishment of goals should be developed through organized input of many sectors of society and used primarily on the basis of local considerations. An overriding long-range goal is to insure that in a complex society we have many comprehensively educated men and women. Education should not be designed to cultivate the intellect alone, nor should education be exclusively for pragmatic purposes.

Not all goals can be achieved simultaneously. Financial constraints require priorities and compromises that recognize the limits of financial resources. Preparing students to make a career choice and enter chosen careers successuflly should be one of the foremost goals of postsecondary education. Other priorities, particularly for Community Colleges, should be career education, student

personnel services, remedial developmental education, transfer programs, and community services.

Priorities in postsecondary education can be reflected in a number of rewards, both institutional and within segments. Possible uses of priorities could be in the allocation of funds on priority bases and in encouraging students to go into certain fields where there are financial incentives, such as "forgiveness" features for repayment of educational loans. Certain programs such as extended opportunity programs, vocational education, handicapped programs and other specified allocations already are funded on a type of priority basis in supplementing other programs. Students may be able to realize rewards for the selection of programs for which there is a manpower need when repayment of their loan is reduced or eliminated through subsequent participation in those fields.

In sum, education is an investment. Accordingly, resources should be allocated in the areas of best return on the investment. The manner of determining the best return is where priorities must be reflected. Existing methods of determining where the best return on the educational investment can be realized includes, because of fiscal limitation, studies of how taxpayers wish to invest their dollars. If society feels that education is an expense rather than an investment, purely philosophical goals will always be difficult to establish and attain.

Under the constraints of fiscal limitations, recognizing the considerable influence of pragmatism on educational philosophy, available resources must be allocated to programs with good records of attaining their objectives. Having students complete a program and become employed or advance toward further educational goals thus becomes the overriding reward.

FOOTNOTES

1. Sidney W. Brossman and Myron Roberts, The California Community Colleges (Palo Alto, California: Field Educational Publications, Inc., 1973), pp. 74-5.

2. David S. Bushnell, Organizing for Change: New Priorities for Community Colleges (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973), p. 88.

3. Brossman, op. cit., p. 38.

4. Occupational Programs in California Public Community Colleges (Sacramento, California: Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, September 1972).

5. The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, June 1970), p. 63.

6. Brossman, op. cit., p. 44.

7. John W. Hicks, Purdue University, "The Role of State Government in Public Higher Education," Toward an Understanding of Higher Education (The Council of State Governments, June 1970), p. 39.

8. Lewis B. Mayhew, "Higher Education Now and in the Future," American Higher Education: Prospects and Choices, ed., Marvin Bressler (Philadelphia: The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1972), p. 57.

9. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973), p. 96.

10. Alexander W. Astin, "The Measured Effects of Higher Education," American Higher Education: Prospects and Choices, ed. Marvin Bressler (Philadelphia: The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1972), p. 3.

11. Brossman, op. cit., p. 14.

12. Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond the High School, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, January 1971), p. 21.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brossman, Sidney W. and Myron Roberts, The California Community Colleges. Palo Alto, California: Field Educational Publications, Inc., 1973.

Bushnell, David S., Organizing for Change: New Priorities for Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Occupational Programs in California Public Community Colleges. Sacramento, California: Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, September 1972.

The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, June 1970.

Mayhew, Lewis B., "Higher Education Now and in the Future," American Higher Education: Prospects and Choices, ed., Marvin Bressler. Philadelphia: The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1972.

Hicks, John W., Purdue University, "The Role of State Government in Public Higher Education," Toward an Understanding of Higher Education. The Council of State Governments, June 1970.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr., Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Astin, Alexander W., "The Measured Effects of Higher Education," American Higher Education: Prospects and Choices, ed. Marvin Bressler. Philadelphia: The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, November 1972.

Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond the High School, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, January 1971.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 26 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION